

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

ROBERT JACOBSEN,

Plaintiff,

No. C 06-01905 JSW

v.

MATTHEW KATZER and KAMIND  
ASSOCIATES, INC.,

Defendants.

**ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR  
LEAVE TO FILE MOTION FOR  
RECONSIDERATION**

Now before the Court is the motion for leave to file a motion for reconsideration filed by Plaintiff Robert Jacobsen. Plaintiff requests reconsideration of the Court order issued on August 17, 2007 granting Defendants' motion to dismiss and denying Plaintiff's motion for preliminary injunction. Having carefully reviewed Plaintiff's papers and considered the relevant legal authority, and good cause appearing, the Court hereby DENIES Plaintiff's motion for leave to file a motion for reconsideration.

A motion for reconsideration may be made on one of three grounds: (1) a material difference in fact or law exists from that which was presented to the Court, which, in the exercise of reasonable diligence, the party applying for reconsideration did not know at the time of the order; (2) the emergence of new material facts or a change of law; or (3) a manifest failure by the Court to consider material facts or dispositive legal arguments presented before entry of the order. Civ. L.R. 7-9(b)(1)-(3). In addition, the moving party may not reargue any written or oral argument previously asserted to the Court. Civ. L.R. 7-9(c).

1 Plaintiff moves for reconsideration for the Court to consider dispositive legal arguments  
2 that it failed to consider initially with regard to the motion for preliminary injunction and a  
3 material change in fact with regard to the cybersquatting claim. The Court considered the  
4 arguments now raised when considering Plaintiff's motion for preliminary injunction and found  
5 them unpersuasive. It finds them similarly unpersuasive in the context of the motion to  
6 reconsider. Plaintiff may not move for reconsideration on the basis of any written or oral  
7 argument previously asserted to the Court. Civ. L.R. 7-9(c). In addition, Plaintiff's contention  
8 that the Court misunderstood his argument at the hearing does not constitute a changed material  
9 fact and does not alter the Court's ruling on Defendants' motion to dismiss.

10 Accordingly, Plaintiff's motion for leave to file a motion for reconsideration is  
11 DENIED.

12  
13 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

14  
15 Dated: September 5, 2007

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
JEFFREY S. WHITE  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE